

## REMARKS

These remarks are made responsive to the first non-final office action mailed July 13, 2005. Claims 1-31 remain pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-31 remain unamended. Reconsideration of these claims for allowance is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### Response to 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-31 as amended are patentable over Jungck (US 6,728,785) in view of (Schwartz US 6,473,758) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). One of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Jungck and Schwartz to make or use the claimed invention. Jungck is directed towards a technique for increasing the speed of file transfers over the Internet by compressing web pages requested by a workstation in one or more compressed formats before sending them to the workstation. (col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 8, col. 4, lines 48-51) (See also claim 1, col. 8). Jungck has one sentence expressing a general statement that "a forward proxy server sits between a workstation and the Internet to ensure security, administrative control" col. 2, lines 26-27 but several columns discussing compression formats and a "compressor" 108 at a web server or coupled to it intercepting outgoing content requests from the workstations col. 4, lines 40-41 behind the firewall and compressing the received files from the Internet for transfer to the workstations, col. 4, lines 48-51. Schwartz is directed to "a filter for restricting access to a user's destination to authorized senders," see Abstract. One of ordinary skill in the art is not going to be motivated to combine Jungck, a reference directed exclusively to increasing speed of file transfers with a reference like Schwartz which is focused on access control to make or use a communications network with controlled access to web resources, or a method for providing access to a resource on a communications network or a reverse proxy server for controlling access to a web enabled resource on a communications network as claimed.

In addition to the lack of motivation to combine these two references, they fail to teach or suggest individually or in combination at least one element of the claimed invention. Claim 1 as amended is as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A communications network with controlled access to web resources comprising:

an intranet having a firewall and a web enabled resource;

a reverse proxy server for controlling access to said intranet coupled to said intranet via a communication link internal to the firewall and coupled to said a web browser enabled client via a communication link external to the firewall, said reverse proxy server having a database with [[a]] at least one capability database record associated with said web enabled resource, said record containing a unique identification number and a random number associated with the web-enabled resource;

wherein access to said web enabled resource is granted to [[a]] said web browser enabled client in response to submission of a uniform resource identifier (URI) containing an address of the reverse proxy server and a character string produced by an encoding of said identification number of the web enabled resource and said random number for the web enabled resource to said reverse proxy server.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action (7/13/05) indicated that the limitation “a reverse proxy server for controlling access to said intranet coupled to said intranet and coupled to said web browser enabled client” is met by the “the proxy server 106 coupled to the intranet 104 and to the client 102” in reference to Figure 1 of Jungck. This is not the case with claim 1 as amended. The client 102 of the workstation within the firewall of the intranet 104 of Jungck does not represent “a web browser enabled client” coupled to the proxy server “via a communication link external to the firewall.”

Schwarz is concerned with filtering unwanted items from a holding place referred to as a “user destination” col. 1, lines 56-57, for received digital content. “In order to access a delivered item, the user logs on to the server over a network link 18. The user

may check what is stored in the destination and then decide whether or not to download it to his own machine,” col. 1, lines 61-65. “Access to the user’s destination 12 is controlled by a filter 20. Filter, includes an address identification (ID) generator 22, an address ID database 24, and an address ID authorizer 26,” col. 2, lines 19-22. Schwarz focuses on preventing digital content from being downloaded based on the sender of the digital content.

In contrast, as recited in claim 1, “access to said web enabled resource is granted to said web browser enabled client” responsive to “submission of a uniform resource identifier (URI) containing an address of the reverse proxy server and a character string produced by an encoding of said identification number of the web enabled resource and said random number for the web enabled resource to said reverse proxy server.”

Schwarz talks about “creat[ing] a new address ID for a potential trusted sender 39,” col. 2, lines 57-58, and then mentions generating a random number for the address ID of the sender, col. 2, lines 58-61. Schwarz does not teach an *encoding* of the identification number of the web enabled resource for which access is desired and the random number.

In addition to failing to provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine them to make the claimed invention of claim 1, the combination of the reference fail to teach at least one element of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Jungck in view of Schwarz.

Dependent claims 2 through 13 depend from claim 1. The arguments presented for claim 1 apply to claims 2 through 13 as well. In addition, both references fail to teach or suggest or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make or use the invention of claim 2 in which the web enabled resource is a printer nor the invention of claim 3 in which the web enabled resource within the firewall of intranet is a HTML document. Thus, claims 2 through 13 are patentable over Jungck in view of Schwarz.

The arguments with respect to claim 1 also apply to independent claim 14. Claim 14 includes at least one limitation not taught, suggested or motivational to one of ordinary skill in the art by Jungck in view of Schwarz such as “associating an identification number and a random number with said resource” or “encoding said identification number and said random number into a first character string using a coding method.” Thus, claim 14 is patentable over Jungck in view of Schwarz.

Dependent claims 15 through 21 depend from claim 14. The arguments presented for claim 14 apply to claims 15 through 21 as well. Thus, claims 15 through 21 are patentable over Jungck in view of Schwarz.

The arguments with respect to claim 1 also apply to independent claim 22. Claim 22 includes at least one limitation not taught, suggested or motivational to one of ordinary skill in the art by Jungck in view of Schwarz such as "a database record associating an identification number, a random number, and a first character string with said resource, wherein said character string is the product of encoding said identification number and said random number." Thus, claim 22 is patentable over Jungck in view of Schwarz.

Dependent claims 23 through 31 depend from claim 22. The arguments presented for claim 22 apply to claims 23 through 31 as well. Thus, claims 23 through 31 are patentable over Jungck in view of Schwarz.

#### Conclusion

In light of the arguments presented above, pending claims 1-33 as amended are in condition for allowance, and applicants respectfully request a prompt notice of allowance.

Date: *Oct. 13, 2005* Respectfully Submitted on Behalf of Applicants

Timothy Kindberg  
Benjamin Atkin

*Eileen Lehmann*

Eileen Lehmann  
Registration No. 39,272  
Hewlett-Packard Company  
Mail Stop 1197  
1501 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
650-857-7940 (telephone)  
650-852-8063 (fax)